DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 071 559 HE 003 686

AUTHOR	Pfnister, Allan O.
TITLE	The Evaluation of Study Abroad Programs Under the Auspices of American Colleges and Universities: U.S. Regional Accrediting Agencies Look at Study Abroad.
INSTITUTION	Denver Univ., Colo. School of Education.
PUB DATE	Dec 72
NOTE	67p.; Occasional Papers in Higher Education, Number 2
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Curriculum Evaluation; Educational Administration; *Foreign Culture; Foreign Students; *Higher Education; Management; *Program Evaluation; *Student Exchange Programs; *Study Abroad

ABSTRACT

This document presents a report of a joint venture of 6 regional accrediting agencies in a pilot project to evaluate 10 study abroad programs for American students sponsored by U.S. colleges and universities. The pilot project was coordinated and financed by the Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education, but this document is independent of the Federation. (See HE 003 678 for the Federation report.) This monograph emphasizes the issues faced in the management of study abroad programs. It takes into account (1) the focus of the study abroad programs; (2) the various types of programs offered; (3) admission and orientation procedures; (4) elements in the program such as study, travel and independent activities; (5) student evaluation; (6) the need for cooperative endeavors; (7) educational facilities; (8) the need for continuing evaluation; and (9) the role of the field director. Also included in the report is an evaluation of the evaluation process from the point of view of the author. (HS)

ED 071559

THE EVALUATION OF STUDY ABROAD PROGRAMS UNDER THE AUSPICES OF AMERICAN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES: U.S. REGIONAL ACCREDITING AGENCIES LOOK AT STUDY ABROAD

Allan O. Pfnister
Professor of Higher Education
School of Education
University of Denver

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Occasional Papers in Higher Education, Number 2

December 1972

HEDU 36086

PREFACE

On the following pages I am reporting on a joint venture of six regional accrediting agencies in a pilot project to evaluate ten study abroad programs for American students sponsored by U.S. colleges and universities. The pilot project was coordinated by and financed by the Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education. As chairman of the team, I have on behalf of the team already reported to the Federation, and work is underway in the Federation that will probably continue in other locations some form of evaluation similar to that we undertook in May 1972. This monograph is an independent report, and while obviously it is drawn from various materials prepared for the Federation, it must not in anyway be viewed as an official or even semi-official report issued by or on behalf of the Federation. This monograph is being issued because of the interest of a number of persons engaged in and concerned about the development and management of study abroad programs. A summary of this report appears in EXCHANGE, a publication of the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs, Winter Issue, Volume VIII, No. 3, under title of "Quality Control for Study Abroad Programs."

Because the pilot project was undertaken to establish some base lines, both in regard to content and procedure, this monograph emphasizes, perhaps overly much, the issues faced in the management of study abroad programs. To avoid the impression that study abroad is only a series of problems, may I say that with very rare exceptions students participating in the programs reported that their time abroad constituted one of the most meaningful experiences in their college career. During interviews they mentioned problems and frustrations, because we wanted to know what might be done to increase the value of such programs, but again and again, they returned to such comments, "Its been a great experience." "I would do it again, gladly!" "More people ought to take advantage of this program." The students were convinced that the programs were worth-while.

If I were to take note of the assistance given by the many individuals and groups in getting the project underway and in carrying the assignment out, I would have to devote several pages to acknowledgments. Clearly, the project would not have proceeded but for the foresight of Norman Burns, first Executive Director of the Federation of Regional Accrediting Commisions of Higher Education, and of his successor, Robert Kirkwood. The other two members of the FRACHE subcommittee, Gordon Sweet (chairman) and Kay Andersen, as executive secretaries of two regional agencies also guided this special project and took part in the site visits. They, together with the evaluating team--Henry Holland, Yvette Fallandy, Josephine Sobrino, John Elmendorf, are properly co-authors of any report issued.

The assistance of officials in Madrid and Strasbourg was important to our completing the assignments. All of the field directors of the American programs gave time both to preparing the institutional reports and to facili-

tating our work in the two locations. Special note must be taken of the way in which university officials in Madrid and Strasbourg gave of their time. In countless ways they have assisted U.S. institutions in developing study abroad opportunities. They were of no less assistance to the visiting team. It was clear that the University of Madrid and the universities in Strasbourg were not being evaluated--it would have been the height of presumption to have suggested such to be the case--but the officials arranged for meetings with teachers in the American programs, met with us, and facilitated our efforts in many other ways. M. Golle of the Institut International e'Etudes Francaises was of great assistance in Strasbourg. Dr. Emilio Lorenzo, Coordinator of Foreign Programs for the Faculty of Philosophy and Letters at the University of Madrid even convened a meeting of faculty during a holiday to accommodate the team.

A special word of thanks must be given to Dr. Ramon Bela, Head of the North American Section of the Institute of Hispanic Culture in Madrid. The Institute has over the years provided a great amount of service to the American programs in Spain. Dr. Bela's office maintains the most authoritative listing of American programs in Spain, and through the annual meetings he sponsors for the program directors he keeps them aware of developments in Spanish education and of matters of direct concern to the conduct of their own programs. I personally have appreciated the assistance he has given me on some four trips to Spain since January 1969.

And I must acknowledge the work of the Council on International Educational Exchange and its director, John Bowman. John invited me to present a paper on accreditation of study abroad programs at the annual membership meeting of CIEE in October 1968, and it was at Palma de Majorca in January 1969 that we discussed in a meeting of study directors in Europe the possible implications of accrediting of study abroad programs, again at the invitation of CIEE.

Finally, a word of appreciation to our Secretary, Debra Kelley, who has typed and retyped countless reports on study abroad during the last two years. She completed the final copy of this report on her last day in the office, before returning to full time work as a student at the University of Denver.

At the University of Denver we offer graduate study in higher education leading to the Ph.D. As an interdisciplinary program, our doctoral sequence requires substantial work in the College of Arts and Sciences. In this program my own interest in recent years has turned to international education. We offer one course in National Systems of Higher Education and have been engaged over the past three years in a continuing study of the impact of study abroad on American college students.

Allan O. Pfnister
Denver, Colorado
December 1972

THE PROJECT

In May 1972 an evaluation team appointed by the Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education undertook a joint examination of study abroad programs maintained by American colleges and universities in Madrid, Spain and Strasbourg, France. The project, undertaken as a pilot study, was a joint venture of the seven commissions on higher education of the six regional accrediting agencies in the United States.[1] In all, ten programs were reviewed in Madrid and two programs in Strasbourg. The U.S. colleges and universities sponsoring the programs volunteered to participate in the pilot study.

The significance of the project is not only that it involved regional accrediting agencies but that it was a cooperative venture. The evaluation team served as representatives of agencies which are together responsible for the general accreditation of higher educational institutions in all of the states and territories of the United States. Furthermore, the project called for the application and adaptation of general accrediting procedures to the special conditions of conducting study programs for American students in overseas locations.

---

[1]The Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education was established in 1964 as an outgrowth of the more or less informal and yet long-time conferences of the Executive Secretaries of the six regional general accrediting associations. The associations included: The Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, The New England Association of Schools and Colleges, The North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, The Northwest Association of Secondary and Higher Schools, The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, and The Western Association of Schools and Colleges--The Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities and The Accrediting Commission for Junior Colleges.

This monograph is an unofficial report on the project. As such it is not to be construed as an approved statement of the Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education. The views expressed are those of the person who served as chairman of the evaluation team and errors in fact or interpretation are solely his responsibility.

THE MATURING OF AN IDEA

The specific steps leading to the project have been sketched in other articles and reports. Whether and to what extent regional agencies might include the evaluation of overseas study programs in the accreditation process was discussed in a paper presented at the Annual Membership Conference of the Council on International Educational Exchange on November 21, 1969.[2] That paper pointed up some of the problems that faced regional agencies if they were to undertake to evaluate overseas study abroad centers, but it ended with the observation that the publication by the Federation of a policy statement on study abroad was evidence of concern about the quality of programs being undertaken by American colleges and universities in overseas locations. The topic was further developed in a paper delivered at the Fourth Conference of American Academic Programs in Europe, Palma de Majorca, Spain, January 27, 1970.[3] Both papers reviewed the statistics

---

[2]Allan O. Pfnister, "Evaluation of Undergraduate Programs: In What Way Should Evaluation of Overseas Study Programs be Included in the Accreditation Process for Colleges and Universities?" Occasional Papers on Undergraduate Study Abroad, issued by the Council on International Educational Exchange, Publication #15, New York: Council on International Educational Exchange, 1969.

[3]Allan O. Pfnister, "Improving the Educational Quality of Study Abroad Programs, Can Standards be Established?" Occasional Papers on Undergraduate Study Abroad, issued by the Council on International Educational Exchange, Publication #16, New York: Council on International Educational Exchange, 1970.

on the rapid growth of American study abroad programs.

A specific proposal for undertaking an exploratory project under the aegis of the regional accrediting agencies was presented in general terms in an article and in more specific terms in a monograph issued in 1971.[4] In the meantime, plans for the project were underway, and a progress report on the project was presented at the meeting of the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs in Atlanta on May 3, 1972.[5]

The proposal for a pilot project, as it appeared in the discussion of the two case studies[6] included the following elements:

1. Any evaluation project should be a cooperative venture of the several regional associations rather than the effort of an individual association.
2. The site evaluation, while having implications for accreditation, should not be viewed as a special accreditation of the entire institution, but it should have sufficient status to be included among considerations involved in the ten-year re-evaluation of accredited institutions.

---

[4]Allan O. Pfnister, "The Evaluation of Overseas Study Programs: Two Case Studies," The North Central Association Quarterly, XLVI (Fall, 1971), pp. 307-313. The basis for the article was a more extended monograph, "The Evaluation of Overseas Study Programs: Two Case Studies (Central America and Spain)," The School of Education of the University of Denver, Occasional Papers in Higher Education, No. 1, February 1972.

[5]Allan O. Pfnister, "General Evaluation of Study Abroad Programs Under the Auspices of American Colleges and Universities," paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, May 3, 1972.

[6]"The Evaluation of Overseas Study Programs: Two Case Studies (Central America and Spain)," op. cit., pp. 47-50.

3. Study abroad programs should be viewed as integral parts of the educational program of the sponsoring institution.
4. Evaluation should be undertaken by a team representing several of the regional associations and should include generalists as well as specialists in the field of Spanish or French literature and language.
5. Institutions volunteering to participate in the study should be prepared to undertake a modified self-study and to provide a written report for the Federation team.
6. The evaluation should concentrate upon programs in one or two localities, and examine those programs in depth rather than spread resources over a large number of visits to individual locations in Europe.

The project got underway with the appointment by FRACHE of a subcommittee to explore the feasibility of a pilot project. The committee consisted of: Gordon W. Sweet, Executive Secretary of the Commission on Colleges, Southern Association of Schools and Colleges (Chairman); Kay J. Andersen, Executive Director of the Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities, Western Association of Schools and Colleges; and Allan O. Pfnister, Professor of Higher Education, University of Denver.

The appointment of a subcommittee by the Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education was in itself significant. While FRACHE had developed a number of policy statements, among them a policy statement on study abroad and while it had sponsored a year-long study of the several regional commissions, the proposed project would represent the first attempt at a combined evaluation representing the six regions.

The first meeting of the subcommittee was early in the summer of 1971. The proposals for a pilot project, to which reference has already been made, were reviewed and at that meeting in July 1971 several basic decisions were made. It was agreed that although the project should be undertaken on a joint basis and under the auspices of FRACHE, the relationship between institutions and accrediting agencies was still properly that of the individual institution with the particular commission on higher education to which it was related. The Federation involvement was more in the way of coordinating what remained properly the accrediting activities of the several commissions on higher education. This meant that the subcommittee would work with the Secretaries of each of the regions and that any decisions about participation in the pilot project would be made through the offices of the several regional Secretaries. Moreover, reports on individual institutions were to be sent to the regional Secretaries for whatever use the regional offices would make of them. Any action growing out of the evaluation reports would be a matter between the several regional offices and the institutions participating in the study. Team members would represent, to the extent possible, the various regions involved, and nominations for membership on the team were to be solicited from the regional offices.

It was also decided to follow the suggestion in the earlier proposal to evaluate several different programs in a single geographical center. It was clear that the expense of sending a team to several different locations in which two or three selected institutions maintained programs would go beyond the budget set for the pilot project. Moreover, by concentrating in a single location it would be possible for one team to review a variety of programs sponsored by a broad range of institutions and

representing a number of the regional accrediting associations. The advantage of concentrating the review in one or two locations, thus reducing expenses but providing opportunity for in-depth evaluation of several types of programs, had to be weighed against the disadvantage that for any given institution maintaining programs in several parts of Europe, an evaluation of one program in one center would provide only a partial view of the institution's efforts in study abroad.

While several locations were considered, Madrid offered some 30 different institutions with programs ranging widely in enrollment and type of curriculum. In order to provide some additional bases for comparison and contrast, it was proposed that a second location, a center in France, be included in the initial evaluation. Preferably this location would have at least one institution that also maintained a program in Madrid. Since, apart from Paris, Strasbourg seemed to have the largest number of American programs, Strasbourg was selected.

The committee developed ten pages of guidelines for the self-study to be completed by each of the institutions participating in the pilot study. The guidelines (see Appendix A) called for brief descriptions of all study abroad programs of the participating institutions and detailed descriptions of the programs in the sites to be visited. The guidelines requested a statement on purposes and objectives and information on such topics as: general administration of study abroad programs, procedures for admission and orientation, curricular structure, procedures for evaluation, staffing, facilities, relationships between the host university and the American institutions, and procedures for overall program evaluation and change. The institution was also asked to summarize the major strengths and weaknesses of the program and to indicate what appeared to be the special

advantages, if any, for students who participated in the program. The guidelines were based upon the earlier FRACHE statement, upon materials drawn from general accrediting, and input from other agencies involved in the evaluation of study abroad programs.

In the meantime, through the offices of the regional Secretaries, 9 institutions with programs in Madrid and 2 with programs in Strasbourg agreed to participate in the pilot study. The two in Strasbourg were Hood College and the jointly sponsored Indiana-Purdue center. The colleges with programs in Madrid and agreeing to participate were Brigham Young University, Indiana-Purdue-Wisconsin, Stetson University as part of the Associated Colleges of Mid-Florida, the University of California, Georgetown University, New York University, St. Louis University, Mary Baldwin College, and Middlebury College. Subsequently, the California State College system was added, making 10 in Madrid.

Guidelines were sent to the person designated by the regional Secretary as the on-campus director of international education (or having some comparable title) at the participating institution. It was urged that the overseas study directors be involved in completing the questionnaire, but procedures were left entirely to the institution. Completed schedules were to be returned by April 15.

During the October meeting it was also determined that one member of the committee, Allan Pfnister, would serve as chairman of the evaluating team and would make an advance visit to Madrid and Strasbourg early in 1972. The advance visit was made in mid-January. Contacts were made with the two study directors in Strasbourg and officials of the Institut International d'Etudes Francaises. The study directors of virtually all of the programs in Spain were contacted at a special meeting of directors

in Malaga, Spain. This was followed up by further conferences in Madrid and with the director of the Cursos para Estudiantes Extranjeros of the University of Madrid. The American Embassies in Paris and Madrid were also contacted and alerted to the project. The visits in January proved to be invaluable in giving FRACHE opportunity to explain the nature of the evaluation.

It had been determined that the evaluation team should consist of five persons, two of whom would examine the two programs in France and subsequently join the full team for work in Madrid. The team as finally appointed consisted of the following:

Dr. John Elmendorf, at the time President of New College, Sarasota, Florida

Dr. Yvette Fallandy, Provost and now Dean of Academic Planning at Sonoma State College, and Professor of French, California

Dr. Henry Holland, Professor of Modern Languages, Colby College, Waterville, Maine

Dr. Josephine Sobrino, Professor of Spanish, University of Houston, Houston, Texas

Dr. Allan O. Pfnister, Professor of Higher Education, University of Denver, Denver, Colorado (Chairman)

Dr. Kay Andersen, Executive Secretary, Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities, Western Association of Schools and Colleges

Mr. Gordon W. Sweet, Executive Secretary of the Commission on Colleges, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (Chairman of FRACHE committee for foreign study programs)

Also accompanying the team was Mr. Arthur Schleuter, Assistant to Mr. Gordon Sweet.

Part of the original planning included provisions for a meeting with the on-campus directors of international education before the team left for Europe. Unfortunately, the pressure of time made it impossible to

implement this proposal. It was also planned to have members of the evaluation team meet with campus representatives of the participating institutions sometime during the fall of 1972. Prior to this conference each of the institutional representatives was to have copies of the evaluation team's reports. It was subsequently decided to have only representatives of the respective regional agencies meet with or contact the campus directors. The members of the evaluation team were of the opinion that the personal on-campus contact with the directors in the participating institutions was critical and regretted the decision to eliminate this aspect of follow-up study.

The institutional self-study reports, when made available to the team, proved to be of mixed value and differed greatly in the detail with which information was provided. Because of the lack of time between receipt of the reports and scheduling of the visits, it was not possible to make an extensive analysis of the material prior to the departure for Europe.

An orientation session for the team was scheduled from Friday mid-morning through Saturday morning prior to departure for Europe. The team met in New York City to review the self-study reports and to develop basic strategies for the visit itself. The time allotted for the orientation proved both too long and too short. It was too long in that basic procedures could be explained in a short period of time. It was too short in that without having had study materials prior to the meeting team members found it difficult to absorb the contents of some 10 or 11 different reports in one reading. If such a visit is undertaken again, it would be desirable to have a meeting of the team some weeks before the departure or at least to make available to members of the team some time beforehand

the reports of the institutions for which they are going to be primarily responsible, and to develop more specific assignments for each member of the team.

PROCEDURES DURING THE VISIT

The team left New York City Saturday evening, May 6. John Elmendorf and Yvette Fallandy proceeded directly to Paris and Strasbourg. Henry Holland, Josephine Sobrino and Allan Pfnister proceeded to Madrid. The two executive secretaries accompanied the team members going to Strasbourg.

In Strasbourg, the team met with U.S. Consultate officials, then proceeded with an evaluation of the programs of Hood College and Indiana-Purdue. In the process, the two members of the team interviewed the two directors of the study programs, talked with a number of students and interviewed faculty members of the Institut International d'Etudes Francaises, a more or less autonomous adjunct of the University of Strasbourg. The faculty members interviewed were those engaged in teaching the American college students enrolled in the Institut. The team also met with the director of the Institut and with the assistant director as well as with officials of the University of Strasbourg. The two members of the team visiting Strasbourg rejoined the team in Madrid Wednesday afternoon, May 10.

In the meantime, the three members of the team in Madrid arranged a general meeting on Monday morning, May 8, with the directors of the 10 programs to be evaluated there. The team then proceeded with a program by program evaluation. In addition to meeting with each director and a group of students in each program, the team met with the Dean of the Faculty of Philosophy and Letters of the University of Madrid, the Director of

Programs for Foreign Students, the Cultural Attache of the U.S. Embassy in Madrid. Members were also guests of the Director General of the Institute of Hispanic Culture.

In short, the procedure, with some variations, was for one or more members of the team to interview the director of an American study abroad program for an hour to two hours and in the process to review materials presented in the guidelines and to attempt to develop an overall impression of the program. The initial interview was followed by interviews with selected students. In Madrid, a minimum of 10 to 15 students in each program were contacted. In several instances as many as 30 students from a single program were interviewed. Members of the team then spoke with Spanish faculty engaged in teaching students in the particular program being reviewed. A second interview with the study director was used to clarify matters that may have been brought up during the other interviews. The interviews were held in the offices of the study directors, and the students were interviewed at the location being used by the institution for its program.

Report writing was distributed among the members of the evaluating team so that each person contributed to at least three reports by taking primary responsibility for one or two of the reports and cooperating on a third report. The topics listed in the guidelines provided the basic structure for each of the reports, but members of the evaluating team were asked to bring to bear as much of their individual insight as possible. That is, the evaluator was to be free to emphasize those aspects of the program which seemed to be of particular importance, either because he sensed special strengths or found special weaknesses. It was agreed that as the individual reports were prepared, the chairman of the team, in addition to preparing his share of the institutional reports, would take

responsibility for reviewing and editing all of the reports to provide some degree of uniformity.

SOME SPECIFIC OBSERVATIONS ON STUDY ABROAD PROGRAMS

The foregoing comments on planning for and procedures employed during the FRACHE-sponsored project are probably more detailed than they need to be for this kind of document. Yet, an evaluation of the project itself would be incomplete unless the reader had some understanding of how the work got underway and how it proceeded. Should similar projects be undertaken, their organizer(s) may be able to derive some help and/or comfort from knowing how the FRACHE team proceeded.

In the comments that follow the pronoun "we" will be frequently used. The reference is to what seemed to the writer to be the consensus of the evaluating team. To be sure, in the final analysis this particular report must remain the product of one person, and team members and FRACHE cannot be blamed for inaccuracies or misinterpretations. Yet, in such an undertaking the perceptions of any one person are significantly influenced by the group as a whole. And, or so it seems to the writer, the consensus of the team on most of the points to be discussed was remarkably clear.

The following comments are generalizations, and individual programs will sometimes differ from what seemed to us to be the typical. The generalizations are organized under several major themes.

Role of the Field Director.--By the term "field director" we mean the person who is in direct charge of the day-to-day operations of the study program on-site. Perhaps the more frequently used title is "study director," but we wish to emphasize that we are referring to the person who is in charge of the work in the field.

It should be emphasized that in this series of evaluations the only programs examined were those sponsored by a specific American college or university, or jointly by two or more American colleges or universities. In addition, with one exception, the programs extended for a full academic year. Each program also employed a field director to represent on-site the sponsoring institution or institutions.

Some years ago, in summarizing a series of conferences sponsored by the Institute of International Education and the Council on Student Travel, Ben Euwema referred to four kinds of overseas programs. The first was the "branch campus program" in which the American institution secured a building, equipped it, maintained a staff drawn almost exclusively from the sponsoring campus, and taught regular stateside courses in a foreign setting. A second type of program involved "complete integration," in which for all practical purposes an American student became a student of the foreign university. Although not a candidate for foreign degree, the student in every other respect was expected to attend courses and carry on his study much as a student in the host university would.

Still another type of program, the "half-way house" involved an arrangement somewhere between the branch campus and the completely integrated program. The student lived abroad, was attached in some way to a foreign university and attended classes taught for the most part by members of the foreign university faculty. Credits and grades were determined on the basis of consultation between the foreign professors and the representative from the American institution. The fourth type of program described was one called the "independent study program" in which the student and his advisor worked out a plan for independent study before the student went abroad. The student and the institution had to come to an agreement both upon the

plan of study and the means for evaluating the work accomplished. The programs the FRACHE team examined were variations of the so-called "half-way House."[7]

Without doubt, in these programs one of the key persons was the field director. He was either personally responsible for or must supervise other persons who take responsibility for such things as (1) arranging the courses to be offered the students in his program, (2) securing faculty, (3) evaluating the effectiveness of the courses and of the faculty, (4) overseeing housing and boarding arrangements for the students, (5) counseling, to a greater or lesser degree, on personal and academic problems, (6) evaluating the performance of the individual students and in the process reconciling grading patterns of the host institution and/or the foreign faculty with grading patterns at the U.S. institution, or institutions, (7) scheduling cultural events, (8) representing the U.S. institution in meetings with other study directors and foreign university officials, (9) maintaining his own scholarship. He had at least these roles, and there are probably permutations and combinations that expand the list almost indefinitely.

Because of the central role played by the field director, appointment procedures and length of term for the director become critical matters. We found a variety of procedures for appointment. Normally, to serve as a field director is a sought-after assignment. Persons interested in taking

---

[7]Ben Euwema, Undergraduates Overseas: A Look at U.S. Programs. New York: The Institute of International Education, 1966.

on the responsibility are more likely to have applied than to have been recruited.

We found that field directors need not necessarily to have had previous experience in the country or city in which the program is located. In many instances, this service may represent the first contact a director has had with the study abroad program of his home institution and/or with the particular location in which the program has been established. Among field directors, previous orientation for the role varies all of the way from having received little more than a vague job description, and that orally, to having served as a member of the international education or study abroad committee at the U.S. campus and having spent several months on-site in work with the outgoing director. Terms of service vary all the way from barely 12 months to semi-permanent status.

At this point in time, on the basis of observation of 12 programs and on the basis of conversations with study directors, we are strongly of the opinion that terms of anything less than 2 years are undesirable. Unless the person who accepts appointment as field director has had considerable experience in directing programs abroad, he finds that much of his first year is spent in learning how to work in the new situation. Many of the programs evaluated in Madrid and Strasbourg apparently accepted this principle, because 8 of the 12 programs provide for 2 or more years or for alternating directors. One college, for example, provides continuity by having two persons in the directorship, each serving in alternating years. Another college reported that planning is underway to develop a directorship based on a team of three persons. All three are involved in a stateside summer program, and each will serve on-site on a one year term every third year. On the other hand, four of the program evaluated appointed

directors for one year only. And in some instances, even with the longer terms for directors, there appears to be little opportunity for contact between the incoming and outgoing directors. Especially in those cases in which short terms are the practice, it would seem critical that the incoming director spend at least a month with the outgoing director to benefit from the experience and to become better acquainted with procedures.

We were not altogether convinced that having a continuing secretary or administrative assistant on-site compensates for lack of continuity in the directorship itself.

At the other extreme is the long-term assignment. The advantage of a long-term assignment, one of more than two years, is that the director becomes thoroughly acquainted with the procedures for maintaining the program. The disadvantage is that he may lose direct contact with the sponsoring institution or institutions. The director needs to be a person who is thoroughly acquainted with current developments in American colleges and universities, one who is familiar with the course work and plans of the students at the U.S. institution, and one who understands the expectations of the home institution. Regularly scheduled visits to the sponsoring campus or campuses can compensate for lack of regular contacts on campus.

One of the issues a number of the field directors raised is that while he might himself desire a longer term, he feels that if he is away from the home campus for too long a period of time he is "forgotten." He may find himself passed by in promotion and tenure decisions. He is seldom, under the pressures of the overseas position, able to carry on any extensive writing or research. He may feel isolated from the mainstream of his own institution during the time that he is away. The study directors interviewed said that they felt very definitely that by being

off-campus they sacrificed some professional advancement. It seems to us that much clearer understandings need to be reached between the field director and the sponsoring institution before the overseas assignment begins, and more recognition should be given for service as a field director.

A stateside faculty committee of one of the institutions evaluated had recently reviewed the institution's study abroad commitments and recommended, among other things, that much more attention be given to the work of the field director. The committee stated, in part:

> If the programs are useful for students, it follows that directors serve important educational functions. This ought to be specifically recognized at the highest administrative levels as well as within individual departments.... It is suggested that the administration make it a policy (1) to review routinely the status of all returning directors, (2) to make it clear to the departments involved that a directorship is prized by the university, and (3) to intervene where necessary to correct any overt cases of discrimination.

The committee's concerns are, we think, legitimate ones, and the specific recommendations are steps in the right direction.

In some instances, rather than appointing as director a staff member from an American university, a college or university will employ a resident national to oversee the day-to-day operations of the program. In both Strasbourg and Madrid some American institutions have made such arrangements. The advantage in having a resident national serve as director is that he is likely to be much more knowledgeable about local conditions, can be more effective in making housing arrangements and in negotiating for classes and classroom facilities. Among the disadvantages may be his lack of adequate knowledge of procedures in the American college and his limited understanding of the American undergraduate student; he may be ineffective in bridging the gap between the American and his own educational system. And, even with his direct and immediate knowledge of his own university

system, he may as an "insider" sometimes have more difficulty in setting up classes and securing teaching personnel. Moreover, managing the American study abroad program is likely to be a part-time position with relatively low priority.

We hasten to say that we found instances in which the foreign national was serving in an exceedingly effective way, while the American director was ineffective--and vice-versa. Whichever procedure an American college follows, it is necessary to specify clearly beforehand what the responsibilities of the director are to be and to establish some means for a regular auditing of performance--to protect both the director and the employing institution.

Primary Focus of the Study Abroad Program.--The statement on study abroad developed by FRACHE in 1967 places a great deal of emphasis upon the development of language skill, and many of the first established study abroad programs did place primary emphasis on the development of language ability. We find, however, that among the programs reviewed in this visit there is a wide range of objectives. The development of language skill properly remains a significant aspect of each program, but there are different degrees in the emphasis upon developing ability in speaking and reading the language and in developing wider acquaintance with the literature of a country. Some programs place greater emphasis upon the study abroad experience as an intercultural experience; being abroad presumably gives a person an opportunity to view another culture and thus provides him with a basis on which to evaluate his own culture. Language is the tool or medium, but the development of language skill is not itself the objective of the program. Still other programs claim to provide opportunity for advancement in a field of study other than language and literature. In

these programs the political scientist or the sociologist uses the study abroad experience as an opportunity to examine another political or social system. And there are other combinations of these major emphases.

With the growth in the number of study abroad programs and the number of students participating in the programs, one must expect to find in the future even greater diversity among student objectives. The growing diversity in individual goals simply reflects the increasing diversity of the student body on a given American campus--all of which creates a bit of a dilemma. On the one hand, it would seem obvious that the institution ought to focus on a limited number of objectives in order to have a well integrated program. On the other hand, if it is to serve a wide-ranging interest of its own students, it must provide a variety of opportunities and experiences.

One of the problems the American study abroad program director faces as he attempts to broaden the range of courses is that many study areas generally accepted and well established in colleges and universities in the United States are relatively unknown or not well represented in foreign universities. Among these areas are the social sciences, political science and psychology. These are still only developing disciplines in many European institutions.

In interviews with students we found that many were questioning the focus of their own experiences. Persons majoring in art resented the heavy emphasis upon literature. Persons more concerned with linguistics raised questions about emphasis upon literature. The major in sociology or political science wanted an opportunity to spend more time in study directly related to his or her interests.

The larger question is that of how one matches the special opportunities of a given location or university with the range of interests of the American students. For those programs affiliated with the University of Madrid, is the particular strength of the University in literature, philosophy, in linguistics, in political science? To what extent can the American program relate itself to these strengths? Or, is Madrid, as a large metropolitan area particularly suited to providing a variety of social encounters? Should greater attention be given to field study and observation?

When students were asked what they expected to get out of their experience abroad, the three points most frequently mentioned were: (1) We want to have more direct contacts with Spanish students, to come to know more about what it means to be a student in Spanish culture. (2) We want to continue the specialized study of a specific major--sociology, literature, language, etc. (3) We want to observe and understand a different culture. While students wanted to have some experience of all three, they tended to emphasize one or the other.

Perhaps what all of this means is that each institution needs to examine much more carefully what it conceives to be the special advantages of study abroad. In the past the assumption has been made that the main reason for studying abroad is to develop a better knowledge of the literature of the country. Students perceive study abroad as a means to other ends. Institutions ought to examine these other possibilities and develop clearer statements about anticipated outcomes, in order that students better understand what they are committing themselves to.

It is likely that no one institution will be able to incorporate in its own offerings the full range of program opportunities. For that

reason, perhaps greater use of consortia or cooperative ventures should be encouraged. (Parenthetically, we find that even though institutions share facilities and faculty, they are quite jealous of maintaining their independence. We are not altogether sure that in the light of demands for broader programming any institution can retain this degree of independence.)

Studying Abroad is Not Generally Studying at a Foreign University.-- No one of the programs evaluated could properly be said to be a program that enrolls students in either the University of Madrid or the University of Strasbourg. At Strasbourg, the students are enrolled in the Institut International d'Etudes Francaises which provides a course in language, literature and French civilization for foreign students. In Madrid, at least 5 different types of programs may be identified, no one of which is directly comparable to the situation in Strasbourg. The comparable program at Madrid, the Cursos Para Estudiantes Extranjeros, was not represented among the programs evaluated, although at least one American college does enroll its students in that program. Five of the 10 programs in Madrid evaluated in this project were primarily related to the Facultad de Filosofia y Letres; the Reunidas, in effect a consortium, cooperatively arranges for a series of courses offered by members of the Facultad but given for American students only. The students are registered in the Facultad, but it is more proper to say that they are simply using the facilities and staff of the Facultad. The students report limited opportunity to meet with Spanish students who are regularly enrolled at the University.[8]

---

[8]Cf. Appendix B for a more detailed report on the American programs affiliated with the Institut International d'Etudes Francaises and the development of the Universitades Reunidas at Madrid.

One of the four remaining programs was housed in the Instituto de Cultura Hispanica. At the Instituto, the college maintains office and classroom space. The college individually arranges with Spanish faculty for teaching the courses. A number of the teachers are members of the Facultad de Filosofia y Letres. Others are independent scholars, artists, or private citizens.

Two of the institutions reviewed maintained offices and classrooms at the Instituto Internacional en Espana. Formerly a girls' schools, it is now the location for several American study programs. The building at Miguel Angel 8, houses offices, classrooms and a library. It also maintains a limited cafeteria service. Faculty members may be drawn from the faculty of the University, may be independent artists, scholars or private citizens. Each of the two programs develops its own faculty.

One of the colleges maintains its program in one of the colegios mayores. The colegio mayor is a private residential unit, usually under a religious community, that in many ways resembles the idea of the British college. It is a living, social and recreational center. This particular program draws faculty from a number of sources, including the Catholic university. The students live for the most part in colegios. Classes are held in one portion of a colegio mayor. The building affords classroom space and a working library. Students may also attend some classes in the Catholic university.

One program is entirely independent, housed this year in a private residence with limited classroom facilities. Much of the instruction is carried on by three staff members of the home institution.

And there are variations beyond the six different structures covering the 12 institutions in the two locations visited. This is only to suggest

that study abroad is many things. While we would not advocate one arrangement as superior to another, we would emphasize the necessity for institutions to be quite clear both in the way in which they describe their programs and affiliations and in the way in which they appoint and retain faculty. Most important, is that students be made clearly aware of the particular arrangements under which they are to study. Many of the students we interviewed in Madrid and Strasbourg either had not carefully read whatever material was provided beforehand or had not been able to find in the material distributed by the institution a clear description of the kind of program in which they were to enroll.

Admissions and Orientation.--Orientation of students participating in study abroad programs varies greatly. Among those few programs in which students are drawn from a single campus or from a small group of closely related campuses, it is possible to have joint meetings prior to the students' departure for the overseas site. One university in the group requires students to participate in a semester-long course dealing with various aspects of intercultural education. At the other extreme, students are given little more than instructions on how to apply for admission to the program and regarding the options open for transportation overseas. Most of the programs draw students from several institutions. In such cases, short of having the students from the various institutions gather at a central location before departure, there is little chance to provide any common pre-departure orientation experience. One group of students from a state system of higher education reported widely varying levels of assistance on the several campuses; the level of counseling varied so greatly that it was difficult to accept the proposition that the students were as a matter of fact enrolled in institutions within the same system.

In general, the students, irrespective of the kind of program in which they were enrolled, questioned the value of predeparture orientation. Most seemed to be of the opinion that the most significant orientation, if any orientation is to be provided, is after one arrives at the overseas site. If this is so, it then becomes critical that the field director and staff are prepared to provide the initial guidance during the first few weeks that most of the students, even seasoned travelers, seem to need. One university system provides what is in effect a retreat experience in which the students travel together into the provinces, have a series of lectures and field trips which introduce them to academic procedures, the language and the customs of the country. Almost all of the programs provide for intensive or refresher language courses during the first weeks. Generally students are expected to arrive on-site two weeks to a month before the actual class sessions begin.

Student opinion seemed to be fairly general that if any orientation program is to be provided during these weeks prior to the class sessions, the orientation program should be fairly intensive. They apparently would much prefer to be deeply involved and wholly immersed in the project rather than engaged in what several students referred to "Mickey Mouse activities." We are fairly well convinced that institutions must think through much more clearly what the orientation program should be and should try to evaluate several approaches. Much more study is needed of the importance of and impact of the orientation process.

Many students seemed to find the language orientation program poorly adapted to their needs. At least in one program involving students from several universities there was little attempt to differentiate between levels of ability among the students with the result that those with a

fair command of the language said that they felt the time was wasted. Although the evaluation team did not keep an exact tally of the number of students raising questions about the language orientation, individual members of the team reported the comment frequently enough to prompt us to make special mention of this concern.

Most of the institutions published general criteria for admissions, but virtually all of the institutions also pointed out that because of the expense of maintaining a study abroad program one of the first considerations was to be sure that there were sufficient students in the program to meet expenses. Admission requirements are fairly flexible. If there is an abundance of applicants, then the criteria are more stringently applied. If there is a lack of applicants, the criteria are modified to meet the needs.

But quite apart from making clear the academic and linguistic requirements, which should not be underestimated, there appears to be a need also for a much clearer specifications in admissions in terms of the primary focus of the program. Many of the Spanish professors complained about the lack of preparation of the students in European and Spanish history and literature. They declared that the American students typically were ignorant of or had only a passing knowledge of general European history and were even less prepared to deal with the historical traditions of Spanish language and literature. One of the basic assumptions underlying the criticism of the Spanish professors was that the programs were primarily directed toward developing and enhancing knowledge in Spanish language and literature. Yet the expressed and unexpressed purposes of the various programs tended to go beyond this single objective. In some way there needs to be a clearer articulation for all parties concerned regarding

the essential thrust of a program. For those students who wish to continue their study in language and literature, a much deeper understanding of European and Spanish history and literature is needed. For those students who are engaged in a more general intercultural exchange, the program itself becomes a means to develop some degree of understanding of European and Spanish history, and these students come with even less of the knowledge that the typical Spanish professor assumes as he teaches his own students.

Much more study needs to be given to the ways in which student potential and expectation can be more closely and directly related to the kinds of opportunities available in the host country and at the host university. Each American program needs to engage in a more systematic evaluation of student experiences on-site. A general questionnaire given at the end of the study period provides only limited insight. Some more systematic approach should involve sampling opinions at the beginning, during, at the end, and sometime after the experience.

The Constituent Elements in the Program.--Most of the programs include a mixture of study, travel, and independent activities. Very few of the students viewed the experience as being wholly devoted to the classwork. But, in the Madrid programs, the Spanish university professors serving as instructors said that the American students spent too much time in travel and independent activity. The Spanish professors viewed the year as one that should be primarily academic in its orientation, and they questioned the amount of time given to travel and long weekends. For the American student on the other hand, to be abroad is not only to have a chance to study in a foreign setting but it is to have an opportunity to become acquainted with the country, and for many students, to become acquainted with large parts of Europe.

Many of the students said that they got more out of the field trips than they got out of the classes. The contemporary American student, to an increasing degree introspective and concerned with his own feelings and experience, wants a study abroad experience to be, if not totally different, at least quite different, from the classroom experience on the home campus--else why go to Europe? It is probably unrealistic to expect the majority of the students to view the study abroad term as an intensive academic experience. Most of the students are going to want to travel about the country to become better acquainted with the prople and the culture. They will, at least as undergraduates, resist any attempt to make the program totally "academic." If this is the case, then perhaps more attention ought to be given to how to capitalize upon the cultural and travel opportunities available.

Evaluation of Student Performance.--Grading practices among American colleges and universities vary greatly. We should not be surprised that there is great variation in evaluation procedures in study abroad programs. The problem is compounded, however, in that much of the instruction, and properly so, is carried on by nationals of the host country whose teaching style and expectations are often radically different from that which is found in the American university.

Study abroad programs face a built-in conflict at this point of evaluation. On the one hand, presumably one of the reasons for having students study abroad is to have them experience a different educational pattern. On the other hand, what is studied abroad must somehow fit into the four-year pattern of experience at the home campus--otherwise the student "loses" time in his program. If a student is to experience fully the

European pattern of education, then he must expect to have a different relationship to the professor, must expect to be in classes which are with few exceptions formal lectures, must expect to be graded according to European patterns, must have relatively little feedback during the course itself. On the other hand, without the kind of clues the student typically gains from exams and contacts with the professor on the U.S. campus, the opportunities for discussion in class, the American student tends to be lost. If students interviewed complained about anything in the study abroad program it was that they were unable to see the professor outside of class, that he lectured too much, that he would not accept questions or differences of opinion. All of this emphasizes again that both the American students and the foreign professors need more insight into the respective expectations of each.

In some of the programs in Madrid there is developing a core of professional teachers of American students. That is to say, a number of persons teaching in the American programs are teaching for three or four or even more of the programs and have made the teaching of American students virtually a full-time occupation. These persons have adapted teaching procedures and grading procedures to the American students and by and large are viewed by the students themselves as very effective teachers. But the experience in these classes is hardly typical of study in a foreign university.

In short, there is need for a great deal more study of intent and a great deal more clarity in explanation in each of the programs, in order to match more adequately expectations both of the students and foreign professors. Yet, that in spite of the complaints, students invariably said that the experience is (or has been), on balance, a good one.

Cooperative Endeavors.--We observed an almost fierce independence among American study programs. While participating in many common activities, each institution appeared to be determined to maintain its own identity. Thus, even institutions making use of the same facilities, the same language orientation program, and in Madrid, the same Spanish faculty, and even having their students in the same classes with students from other programs, made their own particular interpretations of grades awarded by the faculty, arranged their own field trips, provided their own orientation and evaluations. It is understandable that each college would want to maintain its own program as a matter of institutional pride. Yet, with very few exceptions, even the students in these institutional programs are themselves from a number of different American colleges and universities. An institution maintains its "own program" only in the sense that it has recruited the students from other American institutions, maintains a study director and certifies the credit.

Diversity of program is desirable in the sense that with different admission requirements, different course patterns, and different field experiences offer students options which they seem to consider important. Yet when the American institutions at a location such as Madrid must share facilities, classes and instructors, one wonders whether as a matter of fact there is as much individuality as the institutions may claim.

There is a need for different approaches, but one wonders whether with some 30 institutions in a location such as Madrid there is a need for 30 different programs--or at least 30 programs under different administrative arrangements. There is hardly a parallel in the pattern of foreign study on American campuses. Students from different countries and different institutions within a country find themselves in a single American

institution and subject to the general requirements of that institution. An American university would probably resist having six or eight foreign universities maintaining small clusters of students loosely affiliated with it and drawing upon its resources. Yet, this is precisely what the American college does when it sets up a program in a foreign center.

The better part of wisdom would seem to have more cooperative endeavors, perhaps as one study director suggested, an American study center in which several American institutions participate, a study center which would also provide opportunities for Spanish students to study within the American pattern.

Or, perhaps it would be possible through cooperative planning to agree upon 4 or 5 different variations and then through the sharing of staff and study directors provide a wider range of opportunities for students. Suppose 4 or 5 programs now maintaining separate offices and field directors were to combine their resources. Would it not be possible for 2 or 3 of the field directors working together to divide the work and develop some specialized services?

Facilities.--There seems little question that one of the singular weaknesses of study abroad programs is the lack of library resources. At least, students are not able to make use of libraries in the manner in which they are accustomed in U.S. institutions. Most of the institutional programs abroad have small working libraries of reference and resource volumes. Beyond these limited collections, students must make use of the university and other libraries available within the host city. It is difficult enough for the Spanish or French national to make use of such facilities. It becomes even more difficult for the foreign student. A semester or even a two-semester stay in a foreign center is hardly enough

to make the American undergraduates sufficiently acquainted with the facilities and procedures to make adequate use of the same. On the other hand, cost would prohibit the development of any extensive libraries for any one of the centers. Perhaps this is another area in which some cooperative arrangements need to be made. Or, perhaps part of the learning experience is to have to face some of the frustrations involved in securing library volumes in a new setting. A great deal more study needs to be given to determining what the function of the library should be in a study abroad program.

Classroom and seminar space made available for the study abroad programs varies greatly. In those instances in which programs make use of the university facilities, the American students have the same type of space made available to them as is available to the student of the host country. In other instances, the facilities may be of a make-shift nature--crowded rooms, no equipment, no study space.

Student housing is another matter of some concern. Students are demanding the same pattern abroad as they have on the American campus, namely to have a great deal more freedom in the selection of living arrangements. Students want to mix with Spanish students, yet the same students are quick to want to secure apartments with the result that several American students establish their own ghetto type of living. In most of the interviews with students we found that the one item that frequently came up was dissatisfaction with housing arrangements. Yet, reflecting upon the complaints, one hardly knows what an adequate solution might be. Most of the programs initially attempted to find homes with Spanish families. As the number of American students increased, the possibility of finding homes in an actual family setting became more

difficult. In effect, most of those students who now live with "families" find themselves to be little more than paying boarders. They either do not attempt or are not allowed to become closely associated with the families; and the likelihood that the conditions will change is slight. Students who are told that they are going to live with Spanish families should be made more clearly aware of the nature of the living situation.

Limited numbers of students have been able to secure accommodations in colegios mayores, resident halls for Spanish students. But American students frequently find the restrictions placed upon the Spanish students at the residence halls much more than they had experienced on the American campus, and all too many attempt to move out of the colegio in the middle of the term. This creates problems for the residence hall, since by offering a place to an American student, the residence hall has denied a place to a Spanish student. And there also appears to be some implications for whatever subsidies the residence halls receive, there being no subsidy for spaces occupied by American students.

Apartment living creates its own problems. Students may not be aware of the nature of the contract into which they enter. Or, establishing an apartment with four or five American students can easily result in creating a situation in which there is even less contact with Spanish students and Spanish people.

Continuing Evaluation.--Most colleges and universities carry on relatively little evaluation at home. One should probably not expect any more evaluation to be undertaken in a study abroad program. Yet, considering the additional expense of such programs, there is a need for a great deal more in the way of continuing evaluation. And this evaluation needs to be more than the subjective opinions of a field director. At the

very least, interviews and questionnaire responses at the beginning, during, and at the end of the study experience--as well as after a period of time on the home campus, would seem to be desirable. We assume a great deal about the value of study abroad. We ought to be making more systematic inquiries into what is happening to the students and what might be done to make the study abroad experience more effective.

With few exceptions, institutions depend upon brief anecdotal reports, statement of students in newsletters, glowing evaluations by field directors after they have returned to the home campus. Perhaps if any significant evaluation is to be undertaken this too will have to be on a cooperative basis.

EVALUATION OF THE EVALUATION PROCESS

As a general comment, we were convinced that the pilot study was worthwhile. It was worthwhile in that it demonstrated that it was possible for a team representing the different regional accrediting agencies to engage in an evaluation of study abroad programs. It was worthwhile in that it seemed rather clearly to demonstrate that evaluating such programs is sufficiently different from evaluating stateside institutions to require special procedures. It was worthwhile in that it pointed up the need for stateside campuses to examine them more carefully and to maintain more awareness of and control over study abroad programs. With some modifications of the procedures, additional evaluations of American study abroad programs should be undertaken.

Preparation for the On-Site Evaluation.--It seems clear that a set of guidelines similar to those developed for this evaluation should be a part of any evaluation procedure. While a general self-study as it is now used

by several of the regional accrediting agencies would provide opportunity for institutions to describe their programs, there are enough special considerations relating to study abroad that fairly specific questions, such as those included in the guidelines, need to be answered prior to any site visit. The questions should be revised and they should be presented in a different format, but the basic categories of questions appeared quite useful in the conduct of the site visits.

It would be desirable for an evaluation team either to visit the sponsoring institutions or to have a meeting with the stateside directors of international education of these institutions prior to the site visits. It would be helpful if the evaluation team were able to discuss with someone in authority on campus matters of organization, fiscal management, and purpose. Such a contact would enable the evaluation team to work within a much clearer perception of the institution's orientation.

Members of the evaluation team should have available copies of the completed guidelines or self-study two or three weeks prior to departure. Having the reports available would enable the team members to focus upon a particular institution, to get a clearer overview of the task, and would reduce the amount of time for any meeting that would be set up immediately prior to departure.

One way in which to satisfy the above requirements would be to have one or two persons designated for intensive review of several of the programs and have only those persons visit the stateside campuses or meet with the directors. It would not be necessary for every member of the team to be fully acquainted with every one of the institutions to be evaluated.

Composition of the Team.--The evaluating team ought to include persons who have served in general evaluation for the regional accrediting agencies and who also have some background and competence in the language and literature of the country in which the programs are to be evaluated. The team should probably include also representatives from general administration as well as from departments of foreign language and literature.

The team should be selected far enough in advance to allow members to review materials and make contacts with the institutions to be evaluated--if the campus visits suggested in the previous section are to be undertaken. Team members should also accept the assignment as being the sole assignment for the period of time spent in Europe. While some time can be given to touring and visiting, the primary purpose of the visit is one of evaluation, and team members should be prepared to devote the required time to it.

As one member of the evaluation committee suggested, the chairman should be of professional stature and great competence, one who "is a glutton for work." The chairman should be responsible for the details of the evaluation project. This means he should coordinate the travel arrangements, hotel reservations, scheduling of appointments both prior to and during the visit. Ideally, he should have an assistant to work directly with him, one who would have no part in the actual evaluation but who would serve as an administrative aide throughout the project. There are innumerable details to be taken care of both before and during the visit that could be greatly aided by the availability of such an assistant. Particularly is this true during the conduct of the visit itself. Since the chairman should also be involved in the evaluation activities, he needs someone to take care

of making appointments, arranging changes as needed, overseeing the general logistics of the visit.

Preparatory Trip.--The preparatory or preplanning trip was found to be quite important to the overall conduct of the visit. By having the chairman visit the locations several months prior to the actual evaluation it was possible to contact field directors and university personnel in a non-threatening situation, to discuss the intent of the evaluation, to involve these persons in the actual planning and to set up tentative arrangements. Even the matter of hotel arrangements and transportation could be more effectively negotiated through such a preparatory visit. The preparatory visit was especially useful in affording contacts with foreign university personnel. Much time was saved in the visit itself by being able to work out in a preliminary way the details of the visit. The evaluation team would say that such a preparatory or preplanning visit is a necessity.

Another part of the preparatory activity would be the more effective use of an orientation session. If members of the evaluating team have self-study reports prior to the visit, if some contact can be made with the institutional representatives prior to the departure for the overseas site, the actual orientation session can be reduced considerably in time. Members of the team could meet mid-morning or early afternoon of the day of departure and go over all of the necessary details at that time.

Procedures On-Site.--We found that splitting the team into two groups was both effective and ineffective. Both of the smaller groups found their activities during the earlier part of the site visits much more efficient than when they recombined to form a larger team. That is to say, the two members working Strasbourg found it possible to concentrate upon the two

programs there and in a relatively short time probe the necessary areas and develop a surprisingly good understanding of the nature of the programs. In like manner, the three team members in Madrid were able during the first days of work there to proceed quite effectively and efficiently in working with the four institutions scheduled for evaluation during those days. A certain amount of time was lost in trying to restructure the team when we got together in Madrid and to make more effective use of all members of the team. The team members developed effective ways of working together, and when the team had to be reorganized, the procedures had to be redeveloped.

Our recommendation, accordingly, would be to have a team of 4 to 6 persons broken up into more or less fixed two-person task groups, each team of 2 being assigned a specific institution or area of investigation. Perhaps most effective would be to have the entire team of 4 to 6 people travel together to a single location, have task forces of 2 concentrate upon specific institutions in that location and then, if other locations are involved, to have the entire team proceed to the other locations. Given the limited amount of time available for the examination and the number of institutions to be included, a large team tends to become unwieldy.

The recommendation, accordingly, would be that in the next round, if there is such, a team of 4 to 6 persons be constituted, that this team be divided into subteams of 2 persons each and that each of the two-person subteams be given definite assignments before departure.

In any portions of the visit in which an overview of the host institution is called for or conversations with faculty of the host institution or with other officials might be involved, then the entire team should participate.

Thus, if the next round of visits should be in German centers--and because of the development of the Standing Committee of the Directors' Conference, an organization similar to the Conference Board in Spain, Germany commends itself--a team might go to Freiburg where there are three institutional programs, to Marburg, where there are likewise three institutional programs and to one or two other cities in which there are at least 2 institutional programs. A team of 4 could quite efficiently and effectively evaluate at least 10 different institutional programs in a two-week period. In so doing, the team would have dealt with the major types of study abroad programs in Germany.

The situation in Germany is sufficiently different from that in Spain to suggest it as the next area in which such evaluation might be undertaken. Further study in France would possibly be desirable because of the large number of American programs, but there are many aspects of the program in France that are similar to those in Spain in that students are involved in an Institut or in special programs outside of the university, and some other type of arrangement, such as that in Germany, might be worth examining.

Schedules should be developed by the chairman of the team, and visits, interviews, reports, departures from the schedules, initiated by team members should be cleared through the chairman of the team prior to their undertaking. Arrangements for visits with foreign educators and administrators and American State Department officials should be arranged through the chairman.

Provisions should be made for an exit interview with the field directors. All members of the team should participate in the exit interview. The team as a whole should participate in developing any report that might be given at that time.

Reports.--At least preliminary drafts of reports should be developed on-site. Because of the pressure of time, however, there should be some way of getting some additional feedback after all have returned to the States. Reports prepared under pressure are of necessity fragmentary and they refer in a shorthand way to other documents or items that are available. Before these reports can be distributed each must be recast as a comprehensive and coherent report.

Once the individual institutional reports have been edited and approved by the team members, they should be made available to the institutions participating in the evaluation. Perhaps, as already suggested, the best procedure is to have the institutional reports sent to the regional secretary and from the secretary to the institution. The evaluation team would urge that copies of the report also be made available to the field director. Each of the field directors contacted in the pilot project expressed the hope that a copy would be made available to him.

The reports should subsequently be incorporated into any institutional self-study document prepared for a review visit and/or should become part of the institutional file in the commission office. Any general institutional review should take into consideration reports such as the one on study abroad.

Any actions on specific items found in the report should presumably be worked out between the commission office and the individual institution. In the event that reservations about the study abroad program were of such a nature that the overall institutional program should be called into question, the report on the study abroad program becomes even more critical.

Subsequent Contacts with the Institution.--At least for the pilot project, and perhaps for every such type of visit, there should be an opportunity for one or more members of the evaluation team to meet with institutional representatives to discuss the findings of the report. This is important not only because it will help the institution better to understand the nature of the report, but it is important also in that it will enable the evaluation team to assess its own perceptions of the program and to make additions or corrections to the report. We expect that arrangements for such a visit would be worked out through the Federation and the individual commissions.

Financing.--The pilot project was financed by the Federation. It seems clear that any subsequent evaluations of overseas programs will need to be financed by the institutions involved in much the same way as a review visit is financed at each of the commissions. While the overall expense for the pilot project may seem to be large, if this expense were prorated among the 11 institutions involved (indeed there are more than 11, since Indiana and Purdue cooperate in two locations and Wisconsin is added to the program in one of the locations), the cost per institution is considerably less than a comparable accrediting visit in the States.

APPENDIX A--Guidelines for Colleges and Universities

These Guidelines were developed for the pilot project. As they now appear they are the result of consultations with a number of persons directly engaged in conducting study abroad programs. While they proved helpful in the pilot project, they are being revised to take into account the experience of the evaluation team. They will probably be used in some form in subsequent work undertaken by the Federation.

GUIDELINES FOR COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES PARTICIPATING IN THE EVALUATION OF STUDY ABROAD PROGRAMS UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE FEDERATION OF REGIONAL ACCREDITING COMMISSIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

For some time the regional accrediting agencies have been concerned about the quality of study abroad programs. In a Policy Statement on Undergraduate Study Abroad Programs adopted March 1967, the Federation stated:

> Study abroad is increasingly accepted as an important phase of many undergraduate programs in American colleges and universities. Carefully planned and administered, opportunities for foreign study can add significant dimensions to a student's education experience. At the same time, the great diversity of programs poses serious problems for their evaluation and control.

Since that statement was issued, there has been a continuing rapid development of programs. The need for evaluation of the programs remains. Occasionally, an institution will make a thorough evaluation of the impact of study abroad experiences on the lives of students and the home institutions, but in most cases this has not happened.

Not only has there been a rapid increase in the number of programs with limited evaluation of those programs, many commercial ventures have created serious problems. With the resultant uneven quality in study abroad opportunities, numerous students have been disappointed, the home campus embarrassed, and relations with foreign universities and governments strained. Some specific action in evaluation is needed. As one form of action the Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education is undertaking a pilot evaluation of selected overseas centers during the spring of 1972. This evaluation should help both to determine the feasibility of further cooperative ventures in evaluation and should provide direct and immediate value to the overseas center and the sponsoring institution.

Your institution has agreed to participate in the study. We are asking you to evaluate your program using the guidelines that follow. We are asking for a considerable amount of information. Your assistance in providing this information will enable us to undertake a more effective on-site evaluation, and it will also help us to decide on the kinds of information that should be requested as further cooperative evaluations are undertaken. In completing the questions in the "guidelines" please use the space as provided. If additional room is required, use attachments. After you have completed the report, please feel free to comment on the nature of the information requested.

Please return your evaluation report to Gordon W. Sweet, Executive Secretary, Commission on Colleges, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, 795 Peachtree Street, Atlanta, Georgia 30308. We are asking that reports be in Mr. Sweet's office by April 3, 1972.

EVALUATION OF STUDY ABROAD PROGRAMS

Name of parent institution _____

Address _____

Phone number _____

Name and title of respondent _____

_____

List each overseas program offered by the parent institution in a foreign country

Program	Country	Name and Address of Campus and Overseas Study Coordinators
_____	_____	_____
		_____
		_____
Program	Country	Name and Address of Campus and Overseas Study Coordinators
_____	_____	_____
		_____
		_____

MAIL TO

Mr. Gordon W. Sweet
Executive Secretary
Commission on Colleges
Southern Association of Colleges and Schools
795 Peachtree St., N. E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30308

PART ONE

Brief Description of All Programs

I. For each location, give the date of establishment of the programs, the type of program (summer session, junior year abroad, term, semester, trimester) number of students at each location during the last five years.

Location of Each Program (City and Country)	Date First Students Arrived at Location (When was program inaugurated?)	Type of Program (summer sessions, junior year, semester, quarter, other)	Number of Enrolled Students by Program for each of the last five years

II. Attach copies of descriptive literature, catalogues, announcement, (of all programs).

III. For each program, with what other American institution(s) is there cooperation? Is the program part of a consortium activity or study abroad agency? If so, what is the name of the consortium or agency?

IV. For each program, how are the students related to a foreign institution? Are students freely admitted to classes in the foreign university? Do students attend regular classes at the university? If not, what types of classes do they attend? Are facilities furnished by the local university? Or, is the program operated entirely separate from the foreign university?

PART TWO

Detailed Description of Madrid and Strasbourg Programs

I. Purpose and objectives

A. What is the basic objective of each program? Are the programs primarily to enhance the student's language ability? To provide a broad inter-cultural experience? To provide general education? To offer classes needed for the student's major? To enable the student to compare and contrast certain features of different cultures? Simply to give the student an opportunity to study off campus and out of the United States? To contrast the approach to student's own field and to higher education in a foreign university? Other?

B. How does each program relate to the parent institution's purposes and objectives? How does participating in the program assist the student to achieve general institutional purposes and objectives?

C. Does the program differ in significant ways from any of the other programs you have listed in Part One? Please describe.

II. Administration of the Programs

A. Who or what office on the parent campus is responsible for the overall coordination of study abroad programs? Is this a full-time or part-time position? If part-time, with what other activities is it combined?

B. Describe any arrangements with other agencies which sponsor or administer the programs.

C. What kind of direct contact does the director on the home campus have with the overseas programs? Does he periodically receive reports or visit the site? Are arrangements for setting up classes, securing housing for the students in the program, and evaluating the program, primarily his responsibility or the responsibility of the overseas director?

D. Is there a faculty committee responsible for setting general policy for the study abroad programs? If not, how is general policy determined?

E. Describe the financial arrangements for the foreign study programs. Compare income per student with expenditures per student. Compare costs to the students in the program with costs of a term on the home campus.

F. Do you have a person designated as director on the overseas site?

G. Is the director full-time or part-time in the overseas location? If part-time, what portion of his time does he devote to the program? What are his other responsibilities?

H. How is the overseas director selected? What special qualifications are required? Must he be selected from on-campus personnel? May he be a national of the country in which the program is located? What is his official relationship to the staff on campus?

I. How much administrative assistance does he have at the overseas site?

J. What official relationship does the overseas director have to the parent institution - faculty, staff, other?

III. Admissions and Orientation

A. What are the criteria for selecting students? Is special language facility required? How is this assessed?

B. Describe the process by which students are selected: faculty committee? admissions officer? on campus coordinator or director abroad? other?

C. Describe any basis which would deny a student participation in the program.

D. Under what conditions might a student be dropped from the program after having been admitted?

E. What means are used to make prospective students aware of the existence of the programs and of the criteria for admission?

F. Describe any programs of orientation you have for students admitted to the program before they leave for the site. How effective do these programs appear to be?

G. Describe any orientation programs or procedures you follow for the group after the students arrive on site. For example, do they all participate in intensive language study? Do they receive a series of lectures on the culture and history of the country? Other?

IV. Characteristics of the Programs on Location

A. Describe the process of curriculum development, evaluation, and revision.

B. Describe the typical curriculum followed by a student in the programs. How are courses adapted to the needs of U. S. students?

C. Describe how the academic work of the student is evaluated. What are the criteria and policies for judging performance and assigning credit, including credit given for non-classroom experiences? Describe any difficulty experienced in the acceptance of credit by departments on the home campus or by other colleges.

D. What provisions are made for direct encounter with the culture of the country in which the program is maintained? Are any special provisions made for instructing students how to observe and participate in the culture?

E. Are students freely admitted to classes in the host university? Do students attend regular classes at the university? If not, what types of experiences are open to them at the university?

F. What provisions are made for personal counseling and guidance of students while at the overseas location? Who is responsible for the counseling? What kinds of information does the counselor have about each student?

G. Describe living arrangements for the students. If students are housed in dormitories, what efforts are made to bring them into direct contact with nationals of the host country?

H. What provisions are made for social activities? What opportunities do students have to travel within the country? To other parts of Europe?

V. Staffing

A. List all United States and foreign instructors, together with their qualifications, on location in the host country.

B. What are the procedures and criteria for the selection and evaluation of the faculty? What part does the resident director have?

VI. Facilities

A. Describe the classroom and study facilities available to the students.

B. Describe and evaluate the library resources and facilities available to the programs.

C. What special learning opportunities and resources are available within the locality, quite apart from the resources employed for formal instruction? To what extent are these resources used?

VII. Relationships with host country and institution since the inception of the program

A. What efforts, if any, are made for reciprocal benefits to the host institution? Is scholarship aid offered to foreign students from the same locality who would be studying in the home institution? Sometimes American programs are accused of taking and receiving from the foreign location but providing little in return. What things are being done in return? What things could be done? Or, is this an issue?

B. Assess the relationship of your program to the host country and university.

VIII. Provisions for Evaluation and Change

A. Describe previous and current efforts to evaluate the impact of the study abroad program on students, faculty, the host university, and the home campus. Report outcome. Provide copies of studies that have been undertaken.

B. Describe changes anticipated or any shifting of emphasis in institutional objectives. What evidence led to the decision to make these changes?

C. Summarize the major strengths and weaknesses of the programs.

D. In summary, what do you think are the special advantages accruing to the student who participates in the program? What values does the student receive which he would not be able to obtain on the home campus? What mechanism exists for securing student evaluation of the program?

APPENDIX B--Further on the American programs at the Institut International d'Etudes Francaises in Strasbourg and the Universitades Reunidas at the Facultad de Filosophia y Letras, Madrid

The following commentaries appeared in somewhat expanded form in the reports on the American programs affiliated with the Institut and the Reunidas. All references to particular U.S. programs have been removed, but the basic information is retained, because it may be of interest to other U.S. institutions contemplating similar programs. Please take into account that these comments represent the reactions of one set of observations and reflect the points of view of one group of American visitors. It is inevitable that there will be differences in interpretation, but this is the way the two programs appeared to us in May 1972.

STRASBOURG

The Institut International d'Etudes Francaises is a more or less autonomous adjunct to the University of Strasbourg. The Institut provides programs of French language and culture for foreigners. No French nationals attend the courses offered by the Institut. The courses are at three levels, beginning, intermediate and advanced. A student is placed in the sequence on the basis of specific tests of skill in French. Most of the U.S. students in the Institut are at the intermediate or advanced level. Each level consists of a clearly defined sequence of courses, and the majority of the students follow the sequence as it is established by the Institut.

There were in 1971-72 about 700 students enrolled in the Institut. The Universities of Strasbourg enroll from 20,000 to 25,000 students. Of the 700 enrolled in the Institut, it is variously estimated that there are from 200 to 350 American students. Although the American students represent half, or less, of those enrolled in the Institut, they probably in many subtle ways exert a strong influence. The Americans are more organized than are the other foreign students in the Institut; the Americans are enrolled through individual U.S. college-sponsored overseas study programs. Other students in the Institut, representing many different nationalities, enter the program as individuals.

While final decisions regarding courses, course content and faculty are made by the Institut, American influences are present. Staff members at the Institut observed a number of times during interviews that in some ways the program is becoming "Americanized." One example of the "Americanization" may be the newly introduced provision for course examinations. Rather than awaiting an end-of-year general examination, students now will have examinations at the conclusion of the term in each of the courses.

But the Institut must serve many nationalities, and courses are not (and cannot be) directed to the interests of a particular national group. During 1971-72 the Institut offered some 22 courses. There is a heavy emphasis upon French language, slightly less on French literature, and only modest efforts are apparent in art, music and the history of France. The emphasis is clearly upon learning French as the French do, and the details of grammar, style and the formal presentation of written and oral work are the main ingredients of the Institut program. The American student generally is not prepared for the emphasis placed upon form over content in the language study, nor is he well prepared for other aspects of the French educational system.

Only the American students seek course unit credit for work in the Institut. Other students prepare for various certificate examinations. In effect, the American programs have taken the offerings of the Institut as a packaged sequence in French language and culture for which the students receive 30 units of credit awarded through the U.S. institutions. In order to assign the credit units and grades the American study programs up to the present time have arranged with the individual French professors in the

Institut to have end-of-course examinations given to the American students. As we have already noted, beginning with the current year the end-of-course examinations will be administered through the Institut.

Before beginning the coursework in the Institut, the American students have an intensive, on-site "stage" in French language and culture. The American study directors are able to make some recommendations regarding the French faculty who are to be employed to teach in the stage, but the final decision is that of the Institut. For the most part, those teaching in the stage are the young and unestablished faculty, because they are the only ones available at a time of the year which is still for the French professor and student a vacation.

The stage is variously assessed by the American students. In one of the programs most of the students were apparently highly impressed with the stage: many of them claimed it as "the best part of the whole set-up." In another American program students referred to the experience as boring, superficial, a lot of memory work. One member of the examining team observed that it appeared that the students who are most enthusiastic about the stage (and the Institut program as a whole) were those who had had the better preparation in French and were eager to master the language in depth. Included in the stage are up to 5 hours of daily language training, lectures on French life, customs, history and general culture.

The stage is designed both as a sequence preparatory to the courses in the Institut and as a device to permit screening students on the basis of facility in language prior to their being assigned to a given level of studies in the Institut. Some students were disappointed that the examination at the end of the stage was not more clearly a reflection of the specifics dealt with during the stage. The examination is based upon a general knowledge of French language and culture. Students should be told in advance that the stage will emphasize form, not content, in composition, and that the stage is a general, not a specific, preparation for the "Certificat Pratique de Langue Francaise," the examination for which is a general one not narrowly restricted to the stage curriculum. It is estimated that about half of the students pass the examination for the Certificat.

The students receive six units of credit for the stage. There is little question that the amount of work required merits the six units, but the level of work is probably equivalent to lower division American college work rather than to upper division work.

As we have already noted, in the Institut proper some 22 different courses are made available to the students. The Institut, its director and the assistant director clearly have in mind presenting in the Institut a program that is throughout "French" in design, presentation, content and psychology. Understandably, the Institut staff seeks to instill in the students a love of France and things French. The program of the Institut is not cross-cultural in the sense that efforts are made at comparative

studies. It is a French program, and students are expected to accept it as such. It is not a program for the non-language major, as some of the students soon discovered.

Some of the promotional literature employed by the American programs imply that the non-French majors will have their curricular needs met adequately. This is not the case, unless the student is very competent in French and is ready to go into the Faculté. One student, for example, with limited ability in the French language, found after arrival that he could only take courses in the Institut, but he claimed that he had been told in the States that he would be able to pursue non-language general studies in his major, mathematics, in the Faculté. He simply was not prepared in his grasp of the language to undertake "regular" courses.

Some of the students in the American programs, students whose abilities and performance have qualified them for admission, do enroll in the Faculté. Once having demonstrated, either in the preliminary intensive course or during the first semester in the Institut, that they are in fact qualified to study on complete par with the French students, they may attend any course offered at the University. This opens wide possibilities, including work in history, philosophy, religious studies, art history, etc. The students may enroll in these courses for credit, but it is the U.S. college or university which must assign the credits and grades. Some of the students interviewed reported a "loss" of credit, because work taken in the Faculté did not fit into any sequence on their home campuses. The student who does decide, and is qualified to do so, to take courses in the Faculté should be sure that the course fits into his own undergraduate sequence--if he wants American college course credit.

Some American students reported that they had been unjustly discouraged from enrolling in courses in the Faculté, because they were under the impression that they must pass the Certificat before they could enroll in the Faculté. This is not the case, but it is true that a student must have at least the level of competence in French attested to by the Certificat to succeed in the Faculté. Some of the students contended that they were deliberately misled on this point so that they would remain in the Institut program. The FRACHE examining team was hardly in the position to determine whether such was the case. We mention the apparent confusion, however, because regardless of how it occurred, it does seem that a number of the students were not sufficiently informed on what is involved in enrolling in the Faculté.

Grading in the Institut and the University is on a 20-point scale, but as one U.S. student observed "With 20 being reserved for God, 19 for the Minister of Education, and 18 for the prof--what's left go to the students, and 10 is considered a good grade." Pointing up the problem in morale for the U.S. student receiving what seemed to be very low grades, this student clearly was not prepared to accept a system in which high grades are rarely given.

The French system for evaluating student work is much harsher than the U.S. system, and the basis of evaluation is stiffer. In response, some American study directors have developed their own particular conversion process whereby grades below six are considered failing, 7 and 8 are equal to a D, 9 and 10 to a C, 11 and 12 to B, and anything higher is rated an A. There are variations on this scale and each field director makes his own adjustments in the light of his perception of the student's work and the demands of the instructor.

It is not strictly accurate to refer to those teaching in the Institut as professors of the University of Strasbourg. They are persons secured by the Institut for this particular program. The Institut is fully in charge of faculty recruitment, course design, evaluation and the distribution and classification of students. Teaching faculty are employed, paid, assigned and retained by the Institut.

There were mixed reactions to the extent to which the Institut could comforably accept additional American students. Some of the Institut staff members were of the opinion that considerably more American students would be acceptable, but the officials of the Institut were less encouraging. It was suggested that perhaps there are already too many Americans in the Institut program. There seems to be an inclination on the part of at least some of the officials to limit further enrollments from U.S. colleges and universities.

Reaction to the American student is somewhat mixed, although the general impression carried by the French professor is that the American student is a dilletante who does not respect the academic discipline and is unwilling to conform to, let alone accept, the French academic traditions--and U.S. students have too much money, but they don't buy the books recommended to them, and they are not prepared psychologically for French education.

The American student generally is not prepared for study in the Institut or the Faculté. The American student does not know the system. He is not prepared for the emphasis upon form over content in the language study. He is not prepared to accept the program on its own terms. When he is insufficiently prepared to compete with the French student in the courses in the Faculté, he resents being in the Institut where the level of work is much more elementary.

The American directors complain that the administration and the faculty of the Institut make too little effort to understand the concerns and difficulties of their students. And the French say that the students simply aren't prepared to accept the French system. The real problem is probably in plunging the American student into a radically different academic program from the one that he knows without his having gained sufficient cultural preparation before he comes to France. The French classroom instruction is not an end in itself; it is more a series of signposts designed to suggest to the student directions he may take, but the student must proceed on his own initiative. The study of language is heavily on form and accuracy, not on content.

Brochures from American colleges need to underline that an American student goes abroad as a guest, is expected to conform, if not to accept, the host country's social and educational mores, customs, and traditions, and that unless he is not only mature, but adaptable, he is going to find the experience less than satisfying. And the non-language major without adequate grounding in the language should know that coursework in his discipline will not be available to him.

One member of the Institut faculty observed that "American students arrive proud, convinced that they know everything...they need to pursue detail, to learn how to critique." And another faculty member observed, "One would wish that they had more appreciation for precision...that they would come to learn and not simply to travel around..."

American students misunderstand French pedagogy. They assume that they have done their work when they have completed the assignment. For a French faculty member an assignment is never completed; it is only a springboard to independent study. And the French faculty member never seems to get this point across to his American students.

In this general description of the program for the American students in Strasbourg we have pointed to a good many of the difficulties. This is not to suggest that the program is not worthwhile and that the American students do not gain from having participated in it. It is only to emphasize that institutions sponsoring programs in Strasbourg must be clearer as to what is to be achieved, how the gap can be bridged between the French approach to education and the American expectations and what the potentialities and limitations are. There should be ways of better informing the American student regarding these limitations and possibilities. The frustrations of the American students in the Strasbourg program seemed to be much greater than those of the students in Madrid. While there were complaints from the Americans in both programs, with very few exceptions the Americans in Madrid viewed the overall experience as well worthwhile, this was not uniformly the case in Strasbourg.

MADRID

Ten U.S. colleges and universities participate in a common program within the Facultad de Filosofia y Letras, in what has come to be referred to as The Universitades Reunidas. The ten institutions, while still maintaining considerable autonomy, participate jointly in a series of courses established by the Facultad for American students. Each of the ten institutions pays a set fee per student, in return for which each program is provided with 100 hours of intensive language instruction and one course per ten students enrolled among the 10 institutions.

During 1971-72 over 300 students from the 10 programs were enrolled in these courses. The Facultad provided 33 different courses, and students from many of the 10 programs may enroll in any one of the 33 courses each semester. Relatively few of the American students are enrolled in "regular" university courses. It is estimated by the study directors that among the more than 300 American students, no more than 15 or 16 enroll in any course outside of those provided through the cooperative programs, the Programes Reunidas or Universitades Reunidas. The Coordinator of Foreign Programs in the Facultad has been designated by the Facultad to administer the programs for the American colleges affiliated with the Facultad.

Each of the ten institutions in the Universidades Reunidas has its own contract with the Faculty, although there are certain general provisions which carry over from contract to contract. Among the provisions of the general contract is one that in the event the University of Madrid is closed by student strikes, provision will be made for the students in the Reunidas to continue their studies in another part of the city. The alternate location is usually at the Instituto de Cultura Hispanica or in the Consejo de Estudios Mayores. Through the Reunidas, although each university has its own contract with the Faculty, students among the ten institutions may select, with counseling from their directors, a class load of 12 to 17 hours from among any of the 33 courses which have been established for them. This gives the American students in the Reunidas a greater variety of courses from which to select than is the case in any of the other American programs in Madrid.

Certain of the colleges participating in the consortium also arrange for additional special courses. For example, Georgetown and Marquette Universities have arranged for special philosophy and language courses outside of the 33. Virtually all of the students from the ten institutions make up their academic program from within the 33 courses. As already noted, some 15 to 16, or 5 percent of the total, enroll in courses within the University proper. The 33 courses are for all practical purposes limited to the American students from the ten universities, although there are occasionally other, non-U.S. students, who enroll in the classes.

Professors in the courses for the Reunidas must be university faculty, but the individual American institutions do not enter into a formal contract with any particular professor. The final decision as to which professors are to be included is made by the Dean's office in the Facultad. The resident

directors of the American programs make their requests, and the Dean's office takes these requests into consideration when it makes the assignments. Most of those currently teaching for the Reunidas have been teaching for American programs within the Facultad and/or among independent programs sponsored by other American colleges in Madrid.

Should the American study directors question the performance of one of the professors, they can make their dissatisfaction known to the Dean's office. Changes cannot be made during the course of the year, but when contracts are renewed for the next year, it is possible for the study directors to indicate once again their particular preferences. In a limited sense, individual American programs have some opportunity to express feelings about courses and teachers, but since the final list of courses and faculty must represent a compromise among the requests of the ten institutions, there must be some measure of compromise.

It is reported that each professor teaching for the Reunidas provides a mimeographed outline of his course(s) and students may determine the content of each of the courses before they register. A reading list and a text are designated. The professor gives his own examination and assigns grades under the Spanish numerical grading system. Each of the study directors then is responsible for interpreting the numerical grade and translating it into a letter grade for the American university transcript.

While the ten institutions in the consortium have had some discussion about the equivalencies to be used in translating the numerical grades, as of the spring of 1972 the conversion factor was individually determined, and it was possible for students enrolled in different programs but attending the same class and receiving the same numerical grades to receive different letter grades, according to the policies of their respective institutions. There is also some variation in the number of credits assigned to a particular course. The assignment of credits is again determined by individual U.S. institutional policy. The same course in the Reunidas may be a three-hour course in one American program and may be evaluated as a four-hour course in another program. Some institutions have fairly clearly specified standards under which grades are converted from numerical to letter values. Among other institutions it appears to be a matter of individual decision on the part of the study director, and his decision is based upon his perceptions of the equivalency of the work and/or a rule of thumb that has been developed by previous study directors of the same unit.

The variation in credit hours awarded and the conversion factor used for assigning grades become matters of some irritation to students enrolled in the Reunidas. The students recognize that institutional policies differ, but they find it difficult to understand how the same numerical grade can be translated into different letter grades and into different credit hour values.

While there is underway some discussion among several of the units regarding grading procedures and, as we understand it, some agreement for a uniform grading policy beginning in 1972-73, the general principle that each program is separate and autonomous--and this position is reinforced in a number of instances by the U.S. campus--makes it difficult to develop some overall policy for the Reunidas. To the evaluating team it was always an open question as to whether there was a single basic program for ten institutions participating in the Reunidas or whether there were ten separate institutions loosely joined together for purposes of arranging course offerings. Among those American institutions demanding program autonomy the point was made that there are always special courses and programs required to meet the requirements of the U.S. campus patterns. A single predetermined series of courses might not adequately cover the needs of a given institution. Under the present arrangement it is possible to benefit from the combined courses, and it is also possible to make requests for courses of a special interest to the institution. It seemed to us that the benefits of specialized programs as well as cooperative planning could be attained with more of a cooperative planning procedure. It should be possible among the institutions to agree upon a basic core of courses--which as a matter of fact is what is done under the present arrangement--and then, if there are special needs, to arrange for these needs either through combined requests of one or more of the colleges or through arrangements in addition to the courses established for the Reunidas. Whatever the procedure used, it seems to the evaluating team very difficult to defend different grading and credit hour designations for the same numerical grades in the same courses.

It appears to be generally agreed that other students, that is other than the students in the ten participating colleges, are not to attend the courses offered in the Reunidas. It was not altogether clear how it was effected, but it appeared that in some few instances other students, Spanish-speaking but not Spanish nationals, did attend some of the classes. It was made clear, however, that the regularly enrolled Spanish students in the Facultad did not attend any of the 33 special courses.

Admission patterns among the ten programs in the Reunidas varied greatly. For example, one university only admitted students from the university honors program. Another university had somewhat less demanding requirements, and still another maintained a virtual open door policy, providing the student had basic language ability and had maintained an average of the least "C".

Perhaps the greatest complaint from the American students in the Reunidas was that they are not in courses with Spanish students. Although their classes meet in the Facultad, contacts with Spanish students are quite limited. The Americans are in classes for Americans. American students find it difficult to discuss coursework and ideas with Spanish students, since the Spanish students are not following the same coursework. While some few of the students said that they realized when they applied for study in Madrid that their classes were separate from the regular university classes, most of the students said it was not clear in the information they

received that they were not to be directly enrolled in the University. We also found that most of the institutions in their announcements were quite ambiguous in their statements. It seems to us that the American college or university must be much more explicit in its description of the work in the Facultad. The students should know before they enroll what is the structure of the program they will face and how courses in the Reunidas section are different from the regular courses in the Facultad.

The crux of the problem is that if the American programs are to capitalize on the special skills of the professor in the European university, especially the Spanish university, the American students must be prepared in a way that is similar to that of his European and Spanish counterparts. Yet the equivalent of the American undergraduate institution is not really a part of the European and Spanish university tradition. The American has a broader and more general cultural background, but he is not prepared in the short period of time he spends in the European or Spanish university to develop the in-depth background in special fields expected by the professor.

The Spanish professors believe that the American students, with some exceptions, are not sufficiently well-grounded in the language to follow the regular course content at the Facultad. As one of the professors observed, "We who teach the American students, after several years, must admit that we pamper them and try to simplify things for them." Another professor pointed out that it may not be so much a matter of lack of language skill or general preparation as a lack of background in the areas traditionally expected of the Spanish students. American students, with some few exceptions, do not have the grounding in European and especially Spanish history that is presupposed for many of the "regular" University literature courses. Nor are the Americans likely to be familiar with that portion of the classical studies which are part of the general preparation for every Spanish student anticipating admission to the university. Accordingly, to the Spanish professor it seems more appropriate to provide special courses for the American students. The Spanish University is not prepared to present general culture courses; it is a place for specialized study. In the American university it is only the senior or the graduate students who begin to specialize to the degree expected at a lower level within the Spanish university.

It was reported during the interviews with the American study directors that last year a meeting was held for the Spanish faculty teaching in the Reunidas. The Dean of the Facultad was present and reported some of the concerns of the American study directors. Beyond that, however, there is no special orientation for the Spanish faculty members. On the basis of individual choice, they adapt their procedures more or less to the American pattern. A number of the Spanish faculty do assign term papers, provide short quizzes, and allow some opportunity for discussion. Some professors probably look upon the assignment as an opportunity for extra income rather than an intellectual challenge; they are after all involved in their own specialties in teaching the Spanish students. Understandably, the American program may be outside of the mainstream of their interests.

At this point we face a conflict in the mind of the American student. On the one hand, he wants to participate as fully as possible in Spanish university life. He wants to have classes with Spanish students, he wants the classes to be as "typical" as possible. On the other hand, the American student is accumstomed to quizzes, lecture-discussion, and discussion-type teaching. The American student is uncomfortable if he does not have a chance to react to the professor and to raise questions with him. Again and again, in the interviews students came up with such suggestions that general civilization courses should not be simply lectures; they should be lecture-field trips. As several of the students said, "Let us see what is being discussed." But for the Spanish professor who is teaching a single class for the Reunidas and perhaps involved not only in teaching other classes in the Facultad but in other occupations, to take the students on field trips is to him quite impossible. The American student also wants to have an opportunity to talk with the professors after classes. But the professor, after he has completed a lecture, is more than likely to be hurrying off to another lecture or to another assignment. The American student wants to have classes with Spanish students or to have more Spanish students in the classes in the Reunidas, yet the classes designed for the American students do not fit into the pattern for the Spanish students and the classes taken by the Spanish students do not fit into the course requirements for the American students. American students complain that a number of the classes are too large, but large lecture classes are not at all uncommon within the European and Spanish university.

In all of this, it seems to us that the American study directors and the American institutions sponsoring the programs need to be much clearer about the anticipated outcome of the programs. Just what is the student to get out of the program? Is he to continue his home campus major? If so, then many of the courses need to be tailormade to fit into the sequence on the home campus. Or, is he supposed to be in as "typical" a situation as possible? If that is the case, he is likely to find himself in a difficult competitive position with Spanish students and many of the specific expectations in terms of content and presentation will not be met. Or, is the student supposed to gain a general insight into the culture of the country? If that is the case, a series of formal courses within a university structure may not be the best way to become introduced to the culture, or it may be that a mixture of formal courses and more systematic involvement in other aspects of the life in the city are needed.

It was observed that there has been a lack of continuity in some of the American programs. Directors are changed yearly, and some of them arrive with the students or just three or four weeks before classes begin. In some instances there is no overlap at all between directors. New directors do not know quite what to expect, and they must spend much of the first part of the year simply learning what the program is about and in becoming proficient in counseling their students.

Each of the programs is provided with approximately 100 hours of language instruction at the beginning of the term. This intensive language is offered for approximately four weeks in September before the regular

classes begin in October. Individual institutions can provide for additional instruction at additional charges. Institutions may also work out variations within the 100 hours of guaranteed language instruction.

Of the 33 courses provided in the Reunidas during the first semester 1971-72, 7 were in language and grammar, 5 in history, with particular reference to Spanish history; 11 were in literature, including one in the contemporary Spanish theatre; 3 were in art; 5 were listed under the general title of sociology; there was one course in economics and one in geography. Enrollments ranged from 5, course in the history of ancient Spain (Espana Antiqua), to 84 in a course in Unamuno. In one course only 3 of the 10 programs were represented. In one course 11 institutions participated, one outside of the basic consortium of ten.

The distribution of courses during the second semester 1971-72 was similar. There were 7 courses in language, 5 courses in history, 11 in literature, 3 in art, 5 in sociology, 1 in ecnomics and 1 in geography. The largest class in the spring term numbered 125, the course in the contemporaty Spanish theatre. Another course, one dealing with Spanish paintings in the Prado numbered 100. Two classes enrolled only 7 students. In both the first and second semesters, the typical class seemed to be one that enrolled between 30 and 40 students, although there was a good bit of variation above and below that number.